

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 8, 2003. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination. Claims 1-3 and 5-16 have been amended to define more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 17 and 18 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1 and 14 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The specification has been amended as to matters of form.

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that Claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten so as not to depend from a rejected claim, and with no change in scope. That claim has not been so rewritten because, for the reasons given below, its base claim is believed to be allowable.

Claims 1-5 and 7-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,337,929 B1 (Kajiwara et al.) in view of published PCT application WO 97/18527 (Bradley).

The present invention relates to block-based discrete wavelet processing (filtering). More specifically, independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of performing discrete wavelet transformation on an image signal, comprising dividing the image into a plurality of first blocks each consisting of (W pixels by H pixels), and performing a one-level forward wavelet transformation on each of the first blocks to produce sub-frequency band blocks LL, LH, HL, and HH. In a third step, sub-frequency band blocks LL are stored so as to produce second blocks having the same size as the first blocks and each consisting of sub-frequency band blocks LL obtained in the second step (the

dividing step) from four of the first blocks, and there is performed a one-level forward wavelet transformation on the second blocks.

The prior art has been adequately discussed in the Office Actions and in Applicants' previous Amendment, and it is not believed to be necessary to repeat that discussion in full. Even assuming *Kajiwara* and *Bradley* show all that they are cited for, and even assuming the proposed combination of those documents would be permissible, the result would not teach or suggest that the wavelet transformations performed on each of the first blocks and on the second blocks would be one-level forward wavelet transformations, as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly allowable over those documents, taken separately or in any proper combination.

Claim 14 is a corresponding apparatus claim, and is deemed allowable for the same reasons.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37

C.F.R. § 1.116. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicants  
Leonard P. Diana  
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 396754v1